

Remarks

The following is a response to the Office Action dated March 9, 2006 in which the examiner has finally rejected claims 18-28 and 35-37. The examiner has moreover deemed claims 24, 25 and 27 to contain allowable subject matter.

To expedite the prosecution of this case, per the above amendment, in addition to previously canceled claims 1-17, claims 18-23, 26 and 28-37 have been canceled. In addition, only objected to claims 24 and 27 each have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of now canceled claims 22 and 26, respectively, from which those claims depend.

Applicants reserve the right to continue the prosecution of the canceled claims, in particular claims 29-34, by filing a divisional application therefor.

As to claims 24 and 27, applicants noted the rejection of all claims in the aforementioned Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Try as he may, the undersigned could not find any indefiniteness problems with respect to remaining independent claims 24 and 27. As the examiner has not provided any guidance in regard to the alleged indefiniteness problems for now canceled claims 22 and 26, or claims 24 and 27, the undersigned has not made any amendment to now amended claims 24 and 27, other than separating different limitations to make the claim to hopefully read easier. The examiner is respectfully requested to take notice that just because a claim is difficult to understand does not mean that the claim is indefinite. Indeed, in *S3 v Nvidia*, 259 F.3d. 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001), the CAFC states the following: "The requirement that the claims 'particularly point out and distinctly claim' the invention is met when a person experienced in the field of the invention would understand the scope of the subject matter that is patented when the claim is read in conjunction with the rest of the specification. If the claims when read in light of the specification reasonably apprise those skilled in the art of the scope of the invention, §112 demands no more." At page 1367. The CAFC further states "The purpose of claims is not to explain the technology or how it works but to state the legal boundary

of the patent grant. A claim is not 'indefinite' simply because it is hard to understand when viewed without benefit of the specification." At page 1369.

If the examiner, after reviewing the pending claims, believes that there remains indefiniteness problems, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned, so that appropriate language may be agreed upon to rid of any perceived indefiniteness problems.

Now that only claims deemed allowable remain in this application, the examiner is respectfully requested to enter this amendment and pass the case to issue at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis Woo, RN 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
717 North Fayette Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 299-4090

Date: May 30, 2006